



SHERWOOD CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
22560 SW Pine St., Sherwood, Or
May 17, 2022

WORK SESSION

- 1. CALL TO ORDER:** Mayor Mays called the work session to order at 5:30 pm.
- 2. COUNCIL PRESENT:** Mayor Keith Mays, Councilors Kim Young, Doug Scott, Renee Brouse, and Taylor Giles. Councilors Sean Garland and Council President Tim Rosener participated remotely.
- 3. STAFF PRESENT:** IT Director Brad Crawford, Community Development Director Julia Hajduk, Public Works Director Craig Sheldon, Planning Manager Erika Palmer, Senior Planner Joy Chang, Economic Development Manager Bruce Coleman, City Engineer Bob Galati, Records Technician Katie Corgan, and City Recorder Sylvia Murphy. City Manager Keith D. Campbell and City Attorney Josh Soper participated remotely.

OTHERS PRESENT: Deb Galardi with Galardi Rothstein Group.

4. TOPICS:

A. Sanitary & Storm Rate & SDC Update

Public Works Director Craig Sheldon recapped that Sanitary and Storm SDCs (system development charges) were brought to Council in December 2021 and said that this was a follow up to the previous work session. He explained that more work was needed on the Sanitary rates before it would be ready for Council to review. He outlined that staff was seeking Council's input on whether or not to go forward with the Storm SDC increases. Consultant Deb Galardi presented the "Stormwater Rate and SDC Update" PowerPoint presentation (see record, Exhibit A) and provided background. She explained that the current SDCs were put into place in 2016 and were based on the Master Plan's 20-year CIP needs for local systems and the growth cost per equivalent service unit (ESU) was used to determine the local share. She reported that at the time, the growth costs per ESU approximated the local share of the calculated regional CWS charge. She stated that the CIP costs had been updated to reflect inflation and several significant water quality and hydro modification facilities on planned future streets projects were added to the CIP list in 2022. She explained that with the addition of the updated figures, the calculations showed that Sherwood was no longer within the regional calculated SDC. She stated that there was a basis for having a local SDC in addition to the regional SDC. She explained Stormwater was calculated on an equivalent service unit basis based on impervious area of a typical home and it was a system-wide SDC, unlike Sanitary which had different geographical surcharges. She outlined that there were three components to the local portion of the Stormwater SDC and included the reimbursement fee which was based on the cost of existing facilities and came to \$204 per ESU, the improvement fee which came to \$1,222 per ESU, and a compliance charge which was related to the city's cost to comply with the statutes and came to \$36 per ESU, a total of \$1,462 and a

regional SDC of \$585. She explained that part of the issue with Stormwater SDCs was that there were increasing costs but there was also an issue with the policy around credits. She explained that under Oregon statutes, developers who installed facilities were entitled to a credit of up to the improvement fee portion of the SDC if it was above and beyond the cost to meet the development's specific needs. She stated that CWS's credit policy provided for 100% credit against the SDC in total for meeting development standards which often resulted in no returned revenue to the city. She stated that was why she recommended that Sherwood only credit back 45% of the water quality portion of the improvement fee of the SDC and commented that that was consistent with state law. She reported that the net SDC would then be estimated at \$913 per ESU. Council President Rosener asked how SDC credits would work with different types of swale construction and provided an example of small swales on individual lots or swales in the sidewalk planter strip. Ms. Galardi replied that generally speaking, the way CWS applied the credit policy was based on the project meeting development standards and commented that those standards could be different development practices. She continued that in this case, for the city's portion of the SDC, there would still be some credit for the water quality portion but not the water quantity portion and that the development was still impacting the system and therefore a portion of the SDC would be charged. City Engineer Bob Galati spoke on developers getting credits back and explained that typically, SDC charges for subdivisions were easy to deal with but smaller individual lots still followed the same rule if their impervious surface area of over 1,000 square feet was impacted. He continued that if that was the case, the city would give them the same type of treatment because there was nothing in CWS's rules that had modified that requirement. He explained that if they provided water quality treatment on site, they would get the 45% credit. The 55% rule for detention was for instances when the water was treated onsite (e.g. a planter strip or rain garden) and they then discharged the water on their own property and not to the street, they then received 100% credit because the detention requirement mandated that they were not impacting the off-site downstream side. He clarified that most projects currently received 100% credit. He explained that with hydro modification, which was typically a natural stream corridor, there would be no dumping into existing lines because it was a natural corridor. He explained that eventually, there would be an issue in the area and Public Works would have to maintain it even though it was a natural stream corridor and that was why the 55% was recommended in order to help the city deal with the issues that were not currently covered in the rules, but soon would be covered by regulations. Ms. Galardi provided an overview of the SDC comparison chart on page 5 of the presentation. She recapped that she had updated the Stormwater rate forecast to include the most current CIP plan as well as factoring in some revenue projection from SDCs, should the proposed SDC and credit policy go forward. She outlined that the current Stormwater rates provided funding for both operation and maintenance and capital improvements and stated that current capital improvement funding capacity was roughly \$750,000 and would fund things like road related capital improvements, equipment and vehicle replacement, and the projects listed in the CIP. She reported that the projected 10-year capital expenses was \$11.3 million and the SDC funding assumed implementation of an updated local SDC and credit policy. She commented that it was difficult to predict SDC revenue based on the timing of growth alone and the use of credits and how credits would ultimately be applied, but she forecasted \$500,000-700,000 in SDC revenue that would be available to fund some projects. She explained that the operating transfers to fund the remaining would need to average a little over \$800,000 per year to fund the CIP as it was currently projected. She provided an overview of the projected capital costs and reserves chart on page 9 of the presentation and noted that the new Public Works facility was forecasted towards the last five years. Ms. Galardi reported that with the presumed continued transfer of rate revenue from the operating fund, there would be an initial drawdown of capital reserves, the reserves would climb again in the middle of the plan and would eventually be drawdown to help construct the new Public Works facility. She noted that the point of reserves was to allow for flexibility for when there were large improvements after which the reserves would begin to grow again. She outlined that CIP transfers from the Operating Fund were typically increased by 2% per year and

would meet the needs, but there would be some years where the 2% increase would not be sufficient and there would be some drawdown of fund balance. She explained that a portion of the rate was set by CWS, so the total increases in the rates may vary and it would be important to monitor based on how CWS set their rates and the city's growth rate to ensure that the revenue was keeping pace with expenses. Council President Rosener referred to the chart on page 10 and asked if the city had transferred \$400,000 for fiscal year 2022? Ms. Galardi explained that in future years, the city would transfer funds from the Operating Fund to the Capital Fund, but in 2022, there was budgeted rate revenue in the fund as opposed to a transfer and explained that it functioned the same way. Council President Rosener asked that staff look into what the transfers out of the General Fund had looked like historically compared to what it would look like going forward. Ms. Galardi provided an overview of the combined reserves chart on page 11 of the presentation and explained that the actual reserves would depend on the rate of growth and actual SDC revenue and CWS increases to local portion of the regional rate. She stated that based on her calculations, it appeared that the 2% with the additional SDC revenue and capital improvements as identified, would overall keep the fund at a prudent reserve level. She provided an overview of the Stormwater bill comparison chart on page 12 of the presentation and stated that Sherwood's total would be \$17.49 per ESU for single-family residential. She recapped that the implementation of a local SDC and partial credit on water quality would help support capital project costs and maintain operating reserves and the 2% increase per year was needed in order to keep pace with operating costs and support non-growth capital. Mayor Mays commented that the city would have the option of doing something different with rate increases if things changed with commercial, government, industrial, or non-residential services. He asked City Attorney Josh Soper if Council had passed a resolution that stated the plan to implement the 2% increase every year? City Attorney Soper replied that Council had passed a resolution that would automatically increase certain fees every year and noted that not every fee was on the list. Mayor Mays asked that Mr. Soper check to make sure that this fee was covered. Mayor Mays stated he liked the strategy and the plan. Discussion occurred. Council President Rosener referred to the transfers and asked if they were coming from the rates that were being charged and not General Fund money being used? Public Works Director Sheldon replied that the transfers were from the rates charged, not the General Fund. Council President Rosener stated he was fine with the plan. Mr. Sheldon explained that when the Sanitary rates were brought to Council it would look slightly different than Stormwater as they would present different options for commercial rates that would be separate from residential. He noted that Sherwood did not have a lot of commercial, so it would only make a small difference and said that they would also bring back options for bonding to discuss.

B. Hwy 99W Brookman & Chapman Roads Preliminary Study

Record note: The discussion of work session agenda item B, Hwy 99W Brookman & Chapman Roads Preliminary Study, was postponed to allow staff and consultants additional preparation time.

C. Housing Amendments Review

Senior Planner Joy Chang provided a copy of the submitted comments and questions from Mayor Mays and Council President Rosener regarding housing amendments in Ordinance 2022-004 with her responses (see record, Exhibit B) to Council and stated she was also distributing a memorandum regarding Shared Courts (see record, Exhibit C). She outlined that she wished to hear Council feedback to identify items that could be changed in the proposed housing choices and reminded Council that the city had to implement a policy by June 30th, or the Model Code would be implemented. She explained that she would address each question/comment in Exhibit B and would ask Council for their feedback and stated that staff would ask Council to continue the hearing on the proposed ordinance until June 7th because there may be additional changes that need to be made based on this discussion. She stated that she had received a joint email

testimony from Housing Land Advocates (HLA), Fair Housing Council of Oregon (FHCO), and 1000 Friends of Oregon which stated each of their organization's support for the proposed ordinance (see record, Exhibit D), but they also asked for several amendments to the proposed ordinance which Council needed to discuss. She addressed the question of *"The housing ordinance - when passed 'shall become effective' date= I'd like it to be as late as possible - so is that June 30th?"* and replied that the latest effective date of HB 2001 was June 30, 2022 and staff had updated the effective date in the proposed ordinance. She addressed the question of *"Is an alley allowed on multiple sides of a lot?"* and replied that as it was currently defined, it did not prohibit an alley on multiple sides of a lot and added that Council could direct staff to make amendments to the definition of an alley if they wished. She addressed Council President Rosener's comment of *"We should change this to only one side, opposite the street with the highest use."* And stated that one of the key aspects of these questions was concerning the scope of the housing choices and that an alley had always been defined and allowed within the code but the design standards for an alley had not been codified. She added that proposed Ordinance 2022-005 would modify the TSP (Transportation System Plan) to include a cross-section of an alley. Mayor Mays clarified that that meant that Council President Rosener's suggestion was not applicable to the purview of Ordinance 2022-004, but should instead be included for Ordinance 2022-005 instead? Ms. Chang replied that was correct. Community Development Director Julia Hajduk clarified that there would be some things that could be resolved within the scope of this project, but there may be some other things that Council wanted to do but were unable to include in this project due to noticing requirements, so staff would note down their comments and carry them forward for the future. Senior Planner Chang addressed the question of *"Is an alley allowed in any land use zone?"* and replied that alleys were permitted under the current language and added that according to the City Engineer, commercial and industrial sites were typically large enough to not warrant internal public streets. She added that amendments could be proposed to restrict them to only residential land use zoning districts if Council wished to do so. Council President Rosener referred to his comments of *"Given mixed-use standards etc... we should prohibit alleys in commercial and industrial sites."* and clarified that he was worried about alleys in mixed use areas and was concerned that that was a potential loophole. Councilor Scott replied he was fine with that, but he did not feel it belonged in this ordinance. Discussion occurred. Planning Manager Erika Palmer recapped that Council felt that there should be a change regarding alleys and recommended that the change be included during code clean up during the summer so the Planning Commission could weigh in and it would come back to Council as a part of a second amendment package. Council President Rosener asked what the timeframe for that would be? Ms. Palmer replied that it would likely come back to Council in late August or early September. Mayor Mays asked City Attorney Soper if this item could not be covered under Ordinance 2022-004 or Ordinance 2022-005? City Attorney Soper replied that it was not within the scope of what was noticed and commented that the city could re-notice for Ordinance 2022-005. He asked if Council felt that this was a big enough issue that they wanted it to go through the typical process of going through the Planning Commission and having them make a recommendation to Council? Councilor Scott replied that if this issue was included in a group of other potential changes for the Planning Commission to look into, then that process was appropriate. Senior Planner Chang addressed the comment of *"I do not understand the purpose for 'Shared Court'- never seen this before in any presentation that I remember."* and replied that she provided several examples of what a Shared Court looked like on page 2 of Exhibit B. She stated that a Shared Court was part of the design elements that could be used as part of a Cottage Cluster Development and explained that it was designed to accommodate bicycles, pedestrians, and vehicles. Discussion regarding how a Shared Court differed from a parking lot occurred. Council agreed that "Common Courtyard" and "Shared Court" were too similar and were confusing. Ms. Chang provided context and explained that a Shared Court was a design standard under entry location and orientation and the design guideline stated that "building elevations facing streets and Shared Courts should include pedestrian-oriented entrances" and commented that it could be removed. Discussion regarding removing the term "Shared Court" from the proposed

ordinance occurred. City Attorney Soper added that the only time the term was used in the code was under the requirements for pedestrian-oriented designed entrances and the code stated that the code required that if there was an entrance that faced a regular parking lot, it did not have to be that style of entrance. But if it faced a Shared Court, it required that type of entrance. Discussion occurred. City Attorney Soper clarified that the intent was to require that if it was facing a public street, it required a more attractive articulated entrance and that if developers built something that was more pedestrian oriented than a typical parking lot, then in those situations, the city wanted more attractive entrances. Councilor Scott asked what public benefit was being served by having this requirement? Discussion occurred. Councilor Scott remarked that the issue could be simplified by deciding if all entrances should meet the high standard, regardless of where they face, or only require the higher standard if the entrance faced the public. Discussion occurred. Councilor Scott clarified that there were already standards that required entrances that faced the public road had to meet a higher standard, but Council was deciding on if under certain circumstances, when the entrance did not face the public road, should it have to meet those higher standards? Council President Rosener commented that he was concerned that it would discourage developers if the city had that higher standard. Discussion occurred. Senior Planner Chang recapped that Council wished to remove "Shared Court" from the document and revisit the term in the future if necessary. Council agreed. Senior Planner Chang addressed the remark of *"Ditto for Common Green."* in Exhibit B and stated that staff would delete references to "Common Green" and would use "Common Courtyard" instead. City Attorney Soper referred to the previous question addressing "Shared Court" and stated that staff intended to remove the term "Common Green" and replace it with "Common Courtyard" but in the section pertaining to pedestrian-friendly entrances, the term was removed and not replaced. He explained that the original language would have required pedestrian-friendly entrances when the entrance faced Common Courtyards and asked if Council wished to revise their previous decision to only require pedestrian-friendly entrances when they faced a public street? Council stated they wished to add the requirement for pedestrian-friendly entrances when they faced a Common Courtyard. Ms. Chang addressed the remark of *"Errors on page 17 - 'Lot Depth' - is that min., max, fixed?"* and replied that the listed lot depth standard was a minimum and staff would add "minimum" to the lot depth language. She addressed the question of *"Page 17 - Residential building height- not defined as to reference point. Example - hillside project with alleys or without alleys?"* and explained that the city already had a standard way in which they measured building height and was typically used when an applicant submitted a building permit and the building technician would review the height requirements to the standard. She addressed the comment on *"Page 18 - front yard setback for 3 zones is only 14 vs. 20 for others. I'm not sold on idea of 14 ft."* and explained that there currently was a 14-foot front yard setback for Medium Density Residential Low, Medium Density Residential High, and High Density Residential. Planning Manager Erika Palmer added that the 14-foot setback requirement was for the building, not the garage and the garage had a 20-foot setback requirement. Mayor Mays clarified that his comments were more in reference to the infill code language which allowed for a further reduction in the setback for the building of up to 4-5 feet. Discussion occurred. Councilor Scott commented that he was open to fixing that language, but he did not feel it was in the scope of this ordinance. Ms. Palmer replied that she would add it to the list of other items to look into. Discussion occurred. Council stated they wanted to review the infill language as well as the general lot setback language. Ms. Chang addressed the question of *"Page 18 -Townhome= side yard Zero. What about if/when townhome zoned land is next to another type of residential zoned land (and no road separating them)?"* and recapped that staff proposed to amend the table to reflect a side yard setback of 5 feet and add a new footnote to the Development Standards Table of 16.12.030 for clarity. She reported that the existing Code did not have additional setback standards between residential zones, but it did allow for perimeter screening and buffering requirements to help with transition. Council President Rosener asked if there was anything in the code regarding requiring interfacing between housing and other types of development with regard to building heights and referred to the multi-story hotel that abutted to people's backyards. Community Development

Director Hajduk replied that buildings could only be so high up to a certain distance and then beyond that the building could be as tall as whatever the maximum height was. Senior Planner Chang addressed the question of *"Page 18 - side yards - is it clear 5 ft must be maintained - no HVAC equipment, no Natural Gas meters, no PGE meters, no fireplaces extending out into the area?"* and explained that there were some exceptions as far as architectural features, such as cornices, eaves, canopies, sunshades, gutters, signs, chimneys, and flues could project up to 5 feet into a front or rear required yard setback and 2.5 feet into the required side yard setback. Mayor Mays asked that the topic be added to the list of items for Council to review at a later time. Ms. Chang addressed the remark of *"Page 19 - not a fan of 1.5 floors allowed for cottage cluster units. And not sure a requirement for a mix of 1 and 1.5 floor units is possible to enforce long term."* Mayor Mays clarified that he made this comment prior to the last review Council had completed and withdrew his comment. She addressed the remark of *"Page 32+/- driveways - do we have or can we add language around location of fire/ USPS facilities must be planned with residential driveways in a way to maximize on-street parking opportunities."* and explained that one of the items that was included in the compilation ordinance that staff would put forward to Council in the fall included the requirement of having parking plans be submitted with the subdivision. She addressed the question of *"Page 39 - #11-why allow accessory structures in cottage clusters?? If we agree they can have them - then why max of 400 sq ft? and how many are allowed in a cottage cluster project?"* and replied that staff recognized that 400 square feet was excessive for the 900 square foot footprint of a cottage cluster unit and asked for Council's direction. She added that Council President Rosener had recommended a maximum of 50 square feet for cottage cluster unit accessory structures. Discussion occurred. Council agreed to proceed with one accessory structure of 50 square feet per cottage cluster unit. Ms. Chang referred to the remark of *"Page 44 - comments that a section is amended to include setback standards but the text of that is not on any page."* and stated that the setback commentary was made in error and had been removed. She addressed the remark of *"Page 45 - Purpose "A" - Somewhere I'd like it to say in print - City Council has no requirement to give a reason to withhold approval of any proposed PUD."* and Mayor Mays explained that his comment was not within the scope of this ordinance. Councilor Scott asked that it be added to the list of future items for Council to review. Council President Rosener asked that when it was reviewed that language also be added under "community benefit" that spoke on a wider community benefit and not just to that specific PUD. Ms. Chang addressed the question of *"Page 61- B2 - Manufactured Homes - located in a park or individual lot - must they follow all residential design standards - i.e. complete checklist or design review"* and explained that manufactured homes were not currently required to meet the Residential Design Standards because they had their own siting requirements. Councilor Scott commented that that needed to be reviewed and brought in line with Residential Design Standards. Council agreed that the chapter should be reviewed as soon as possible. Senior Planner Chang addressed the question of *"Page 65 - can we alter standards for parking space size?- like fewer compact? And/or space must be larger if next to a wall or tree or other object?"* and explained that the city did not currently require a parking plan except for townhomes but staff was planning to bring forward an ordinance this summer regarding parking plans that would require that a parking plan be submitted for all residential developments. She addressed Mayor Mays's remarks and questions on page 5 of Exhibit B regarding cottage clusters and alleys, shared open space, and shared pathways. She explained that all cottage cluster developments were required to abut a public street, but each unit within the cluster was not required to abut a public street and could instead be built to abut a private street, shared open space, or a shared pathway. Councilor Scott stated that he felt it was acceptable as long as there was a sidewalk or paved pathway from the public street to every unit. Ms. Chang replied that there was a required interconnectedness that connected each cottage cluster unit to the sidewalk in the public right-of-way. Discussion occurred. She addressed the remark of *"I also don't like private streets and want to prohibit them - can we nix this in this process or do we do that with TSP update when I hope to review the future of Alleys in town."* Ms. Chang explained that a PUD would allow the City Engineer the flexibility to allow for private

streets and added that private streets were only allowed for two lots or less. Discussion occurred. Mayor Mays asked that private streets be added to the list for Council to discuss. City Engineer Bob Galati explained the difficulty with private streets and discussion occurred. Senior Planner Chang stated that she was asking for Council to continue the hearing on Ordinance 2022-004 to the June 7th meeting and explained that the proposed ordinance would then have to be adopted under the emergency protocol. Discussion occurred.

5. ADJOURNED:

Mayor Mays adjourned the work session at 6:50 pm.

REGULAR SESSION

- 1. CALL TO ORDER:** Mayor Mays called the meeting to order at 7:03 pm.
- 2. COUNCIL PRESENT:** Mayor Keith Mays, Councilors Kim Young, Doug Scott, Renee Brouse, and Taylor Giles. Councilors Sean Garland and Council President Tim Rosener participated remotely.
- 3. STAFF PRESENT:** Police Chief Ty Hanlon, Senior Planner Joy Chang, IT Director Brad Crawford, Public Works Director Craig Sheldon, Community Development Director Julia Hajduk, Planning Manager Erika Palmer, Economic Development Manager Bruce Coleman, City Engineer Bob Galati, and City Recorder Sylvia Murphy. City Manager Keith D. Campbell and City Attorney Josh Soper participated remotely.

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

MOTION: FROM COUNCILOR YOUNG TO APPROVE THE AGENDA. SECONDED BY COUNCILOR SCOTT. MOTION PASSED 7:0, ALL MEMBERS VOTED IN FAVOR.

Mayor Mays addressed the next agenda item.

5. CONSENT AGENDA:

- A. Approval of May 3, 2022 City Council Meeting Minutes**
- B. Resolution 2022-024, Authorizing the City Manager to Purchase Vehicles and Equipment for Sherwood Broadband**
- C. Resolution 2022-025, Authorizing the City Manager to Acquire Real Property**
- D. Resolution 2022-026, Declaring the Need to Acquire Real Property Interests to Construct and Thereafter Operate & Maintain Infrastructure Related to the SW Oregon Street Improvements Project**

MOTION: FROM COUNCILOR BROUSE TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA. SECONDED BY COUNCILOR SCOTT. MOTION PASSED 7:0, ALL MEMBERS VOTED IN FAVOR.

Mayor Mays addressed the next agenda item.

6. CITIZEN COMMENTS:

Sherwood resident Dave Sweeney came forward and read aloud his testimony regarding trees located on Red Fern Drive. He asked that Council visit the site to see the trees at the south end of Red Fern Drive in order to help Council better understand the situation and have more information to help inform their decision regarding the trees. He stated that children had been playing in that forest for over 25 years and asked that Council not allow for the forest to be cut down and instead preserve the forest for future generations. He asked that Council visit and walk down the Arbor Lane trail to understand how well the trail wound through the forest and how well the trail would integrate into a trail through the flagpole section down to Brookman Road. He stated that most of the 115 trees had been growing for over 100 years and if they were to be cut down, it would leave a "700-foot scar through the land." He stated that the trees were slated to be cut down by developers in order to accommodate two houses and a private driveway. He stated that the construction of the two houses would, "result in the destruction of a natural area that kids and adults have enjoyed for a generation" and the two houses would destroy a natural area and the wildlife habitat the area provided. He asked that Council find a way to protect the trees from destruction and to visit the site to fully understand the situation. He commented that Council had options such as the "tree ordinance" and the 5% park district requirement for usable open space from developments. He thanked Councilors Brouse and Giles for visiting the site.

Mayor Mays addressed the next agenda item and the City Recorder read the public hearing statement.

7. PUBLIC HEARING:

A. Ordinance 2022-004 Amending sections of the Sherwood Zoning and Community Development Code for New Housing Choices to comply with Oregon HB 2001 *(Continued Hearing)*

Mayor Mays recapped that this was the third hearing for this ordinance and explained that Council had held a work session to review and discuss both his and Council President Rosener's previously submitted comments and questions on the ordinance prior to this meeting. He stated that Council had decided to continue the hearing on this ordinance to the June 7th City Council meeting in order to incorporate the direction Council had provided to staff on the proposed ordinance. Senior Planner Joy Chang stated that she had received a joint email testimony from Housing Land Advocates (HLA), Fair Housing Council of Oregon (FHCO), and 1000 Friends of Oregon which stated each of their organization's support for the proposed ordinance (Exhibit D). She explained that the email asked for several amendments to the proposed ordinance to improve the prospects of increasing access to more affordable housing types by either creating detached homes in plex developments, eliminating parking requirements, and allowing for density bonus. She stated they also requested that Council defer the adoption of the amendments until full Goal 10 findings could be made. Ms. Chang addressed the Goal 10 findings comment and explained that the Sherwood Housing Needs Analysis would need to be updated in 2026, at which time an added percentage for middle housing capacity may be reflected in the analysis. She stated that staff felt that the Goal 10 findings were sufficient. She recommended Council hold a third hearing on the proposed ordinance at this meeting in order to receive public testimony and then continue the hearing to June 7th to allow staff time to incorporate the feedback they had received from Council on the proposed amendments. Mayor Mays opened the public hearing and asked for public comment on the proposed ordinance. Hearing none, Mayor Mays closed the public hearing and asked for discussion or questions from Council.

MOTION: FROM COUNCILOR BROUSE TO CONTINUE THE DISCUSSION OF ORDINANCE 2022-004 AMENDING SECTIONS OF THE SHERWOOD ZONING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CODE FOR NEW HOUSING CHOICES TO COMPLY WITH OREGON HB 2001 TO THE JUNE 7TH CITY COUNCIL

MEETING. SECONDED BY COUNCILOR YOUNG. MOTION PASSED 7:0, ALL MEMBERS VOTED IN FAVOR.

B. Ordinance 2022-005 Amending sections of the Transportation System Plan for Housing Choices
(First Hearing)

Senior Planner Joy Chang presented the "Transportation System Plan Amendments" PowerPoint presentation (see record, Exhibit E) and provided background. She explained that the Transportation Systems Plan (TSP) went through its last major update in 2014 and through the implementation of House Bill 2001, it was identified that a cross section detail for a public alley was missing from the adopted 2014 TSP. She reported that City Council, Planning Commission, and the Sherwood community had identified that safety and on-street parking were valued benefits to the Sherwood Community and staff were therefore proposing amendments to the TSP that included a new public alley cross section detail and a revised standard for residential roadways. She provided an overview of the proposed public alley cross section on page 4 of the presentation and explained that public alleys had been allowed in the Sherwood Development Code, but a cross section detail for a public alley was missing and the amendment would add the new cross section to the TSP. She reported that the public alley cross section would show a 21-foot ROW with a mountable curb, 16-foot pedestrian level light pole, a 5-foot public utility easement, and on-street parking would not be permitted. She stated that Pride Disposal had confirmed that their trucks would be able to clear the proposed 16-foot light pole. She commented that it had also been noted that on-street parking would not be permitted on either side of the alley. Senior Planner Chang outlined that Council had identified in a previous work session that the pedestrian level light pole should meet the typical street standard and requested that the Planning Commission consider changing the pole height from 12 feet in height to the standard 20 feet. She recapped that it was determined that a 20-foot light pole would have a light intrusion of 17.7 feet and would impact second story windows whereas the 16-foot poles had a light intrusion of 13.7 feet and did not impact second story windows. She reported that City Engineer Bob Galati had confirmed that pedestrian level light poles did not limit good light for vehicular travel, and they limited light intrusion to adjacent second floor residential units. She noted that pedestrian scale lights required additional light poles due to light spacing standards. She stated the Planning Commission recommended the 16-foot-high light pole for public alley streets. Ms. Chang addressed residential standard right-of-way and stated that City Council, Planning Commission, and the Sherwood community had identified that safety and on-street parking were valued benefits to the Sherwood Community. She explained that the existing 28-foot residential standard cross section only allowed for parking on one side of the street and staff proposed a 36-foot residential standard cross section that would allow for parking on both sides of the street. She explained that the proposed 36-foot residential standard would allow for additional on-street parking and commented that the vast majority of Sherwood residents travelled outside of the city for employment and other transportation options were limited. She outlined that Sherwood's two bus lines did not offer frequent service, they did not serve a significant portion of Sherwood's residential areas, and they did not connect Sherwood's residential areas to services. She reported that Sherwood had a vehicle per household average of 1.97, which was 8% higher rate of car ownership than Washington County as a whole and was 33% higher than Portland. She stated that the increased paved roadway width would allow for additional on-street parking that was consistent with the operational needs of the Residential street facility. Senior Planner Chang reported that throughout the city's comprehensive planning process, residents had indicated in surveys that additional on-street parking was needed. She referred to disagreements between neighbors due to limited on-street parking and stated that if the city decided to increase the paved width of the local residential street standard, it would not be inconsistent with the city's adopted Comprehensive Plan or TSP. She continued that the updated residential street standard, in addition to the goals and policies within the city's TSP, would still provide for safe and convenient pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicular circulation that was consistent with access

management standards and that public safety vehicles would be able to maneuver and deploy equipment safely within a wider street. She provided an overview of the applicable criteria and findings for a plan amendment on pages 9-10 of the presentation and stated that all other applicable criteria were addressed in the staff report and the proposed amendments met the criteria. She recapped that the addition of the public alley cross section detail would provide the opportunity for a different classification of roadway and could assist with affordability on certain types of development. She recapped that the proposed 36-foot roadway residential standard would provide two lanes of vehicular travel and on-street parking that met Sherwood's existing and future needs for safe, efficient and well-connected streets. She stated that notice of the application was routed to DLCD on February 2, 2022, an email-notice was sent to Metro and agency partners on February 17, 2022, and newspaper publication was completed through the local times publication. Senior Planner Chang stated that besides Pride Disposal, no other agencies had provided comment on the revised proposed plan amendment. She recapped that at the March 8, 2022 Planning Commission hearing, Neil Shannon provided testimony in favor of the proposed amendment that would include the new 36-foot residential standards cross section and that a 28-foot street impacted safety and efficiency. He also had concerns that the 12-foot height of the public alley pedestrian light could potentially damage utility vehicles. Ms. Chang clarified that the height of the pedestrian lighting had been increased from the original proposed height of 12 feet to 16 feet. She summarized that based on the findings and applicable code criteria, staff recommended that Council approve the proposed text amendments and hold the second public hearing for Ordinance 2022-005 on June 7, 2022. Mayor Mays opened the public hearing and asked for public comment on the proposed ordinance. Hearing none, Mayor Mays closed the public hearing and asked for discussion or questions from Council. Councilor Young asked if the new DLCD rule would impact the street width amendment? Mayor Mays replied that it would, and that it was an interim standard until the state mandated a different standard in the future. Council President Rosener explained that the DLCD wanted to limit street widths to 28-feet and commented he felt that 28-foot wide streets were not compatible with the Sherwood community. Councilor Giles commented that street width was a safety issue for drivers and children playing in or near the street. Councilor Scott thanked Senior Planner Chang for her work on the proposed ordinance and commented he was in favor of all aspects of the ordinance. Mayor Mays stated that the proposed ordinance would be back for a second hearing at the June 7th City Council meeting.

Mayor Mays addressed the next agenda item.

8. CITY MANAGER REPORT:

City Manager Keith Campbell explained that he had received Community Development Director Julia Hajduk's notice of resignation. He stated Ms. Hajduk had been with the city for nearly 17 years and had helped to "create one of the best places and best communities to live, work, and play." He thanked Ms. Hajduk for her dedication and time with the city and he wished her well on her new position as the City Manager of Stayton. Mayor Mays expressed it was bittersweet news to hear and commented that the new position was a great opportunity for Ms. Hajduk and her family and that "we were lucky to have you for the last 17 years...your hard work, your countless hours" and wished her the best. Councilor Young thanked Ms. Hajduk for her willingness to answer councilor questions and help them understand the many processes that occurred in community development and wished Ms. Hajduk the best. Councilor Giles commented that having come from the Planning Commission, it "routinely amazed" him at the amount of knowledge city staff had and stated that that was a credit to Ms. Hajduk's leadership style and her ability to foster an excellent team that was always prepared and congratulated her on her new position. Councilor Garland stated that "people often point to Sherwood as being one of the most livable cities and Julia is a major part of that" and that her ability to visualize and plan for 5-10 years into the future was why Sherwood was so great. He

thanked her for sharing her knowledge with Council and wished her good luck in her new position. Councilor Brouse commented that she loved watching Ms. Hajduk interact with her staff and see what staff was able to accomplish because of her leadership and stated that Ms. Hajduk would do well in her new position and wished her good luck. Councilor Scott thanked Ms. Hajduk for her mentorship, kind words, and patience through the years and stated he echoed the other councilor's sentiments. Council President Rosener stated he agreed with the other councilor's comments and said that he had learned a lot from Ms. Hajduk and thanked her for her grace and ability to explain things and offer alternatives when appropriate.

Community Development Director Hajduk stated that she would not be able to go where she was going without the Sherwood community and she hoped to replicate what made Sherwood so remarkable in Stayton. She expressed that Council and the community had taught her a lot and that she would miss Sherwood, but she was excited for the next endeavor.

Mayor Mays addressed the next agenda item.

9. COUNCIL ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Councilor Garland reported that he had recently driven around nearby cities and had observed many campaign signs along the roads and gave his kudos to Code Compliance Officer Dan Miller for his work as well as current and former Council and staff who had drafted Sherwood's sign code standards. He reported he attended the Cultural Arts Commission meeting on May 16th and announced that there would be two upcoming vacancies on the board. He encouraged residents to apply to serve on the Cultural Arts Commission.

Council President Rosener reported he attended the LOC policy committees meeting where they completed their work on the Broadband Committee and submitted five policy statements that would go to the board and LOC members. He reported work on the Taxation Committee and Community Development Committee continued their work.

Councilor Giles thanked the school district and Police Department for their professionalism during the previous weekend's activities. He stated he was grateful to "live in a community with a police force that does things the right way" and took student safety seriously. He reported he attended the Planning Commission meeting and congratulated the new Planning Commission members and encouraged residents to get involved with the Planning Commission. He reported that the high school was putting on Shakespeare's "A Midsummer Night's Dream" May 20-22nd.

Councilor Young reported on National Police week and the upcoming Police Advisory Board meeting.

Councilor Brouse reported that the Library Advisory Board would meet May 18th and the Senior Advisory Board met last week but there was no quorum. She reported the Housing Advisory Committee would meet next week. She stated that tickets to the Sherwood Police Foundation gala on June 24th were available.

Councilor Scott reported that the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board did not meet in May but would meet on June 6th.

Mayor Mays reported that he attended a LOC committee meeting on transportation and would submit policy statements to the board and LOC members. He reported he traveled to Washington D.C. to lobby on behalf

of Sherwood and met with Senator Merkley's staff and Senator Wyden and his staff to discuss Sherwood's four funding priorities. He explained that the projects were: sewer line replacement in Old Town, sewer line replacement near Old Town, a grant to help pay for the tannery site cleanup and building Ice Age Drive to help provide access into the TEA. He explained that the finalized list would be published in roughly three weeks. He gave his kudos to Police Chief Ty Hanlon and his staff.

10. ADJOURN:

Mayor Mays adjourned the regular session at 7:52 pm and convened an executive session.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** The executive session was called to order at 9:01 pm.
2. **COUNCIL PRESENT:** Council President Tim Rosener, Councilors Kim Young, Doug Scott, Renee Brouse, Sean Garland, and Taylor Giles. Mayor Keith Mays was absent.
3. **STAFF PRESENT:** City Attorney Josh Soper, and City Manager Keith Campbell.
4. **TOPICS**

A. ORS 192.660(2)(e) Real Property Transactions

5. ADJOURN:

The executive session was adjourned at 9:08 pm.

Attest:



Sylvia Murphy, MMC, City Recorder



Keith Mays, Mayor